



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

HJD

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/805,023	03/18/2004	Hirokazu Ikeda	16869K-111100US	9205
20350	7590	09/18/2007	EXAMINER	
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP			NGUYEN, TAN D	
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
EIGHTH FLOOR			3629	
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/18/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/805,023	IKEDA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tan Dean D. Nguyen	3629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 March 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 21,23-25,27 and 28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,23-25,27 and 28 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The amendment filed 3/29/07 has been entered. Claims 21, 23-24, 25, 27-28 are pending and are rejected as followed. Claims 22 and 26 have been canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 21, 23-24 (method), 25, 27-28 (apparatus) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (1) VACANTE et al in view of (2) HAYASHI et al.

As of 10/30/06, independent method claim 21 is as followed:

21. (Currently amended) A job controlling method in a computer system which includes a host computer and a storage apparatus, comprising:

- (a) storing condition information including a plurality of conditions for controlling the host computer or the storage apparatus;
- (b) defining a job for executing a process for the host computer or the storage apparatus with a parameter for executing;
- (c.) calculating an inconsistency degree of the defined job with the condition information by comparing the parameter of the job with the condition information;
- (d) outputting result of comparison of the parameter of the job with the condition information, the result including an inconsistency degree;
 - (e1) if the inconsistency degree is within a predefined threshold, then executing the job according to the parameter; and
 - (e2) if the inconsistency degree is not within the predefined threshold, then changing the parameter of the job according to the result of the comparison and recalculating the inconsistency degree.

Note, for convenience, letters (a)-(e) are added to the beginning of each step.

Similarly, VACANTE et al which deals with a method for controlling an information processing system {see Fig. 1}, comprising the steps of:

(a) storing a condition information processing system including a provision to policies each of which defines a process to be executed in the system, wherein the strategy is a control (precedent) policy to manage network traffic {see col. 1, lines 55-57, col. 3, lines 8-38, Fig. 2};

(b) defining a job for executing a process for the host computer or the storage apparatus with a parameter for executing (managing traffic of the network) {see col. 1, lines 12-57, col. 4, lines 30-65}; and

(e) changing said parameters so that said policies meet the control (precedent) strategy when said parameters are set to said processes defined in said policies", {see col. 1, lines 55-65, col. 4, lines 30-55}

(e2) changing configuration as necessary to implement the policy {see Fig. 4, 460, col. 1, lines 60-65, col. 4, lines 55-67, "...until corrected, the network may be handicapped in its ability to carry traffic... user to correct....", col. 5, lines 1-45}.

Note that VACANTE et al discloses on col. 3, lines 39-60, that a policy is abstract set of rules containing conditions information which, when evaluated, determine how traffic on a network is to be handled. On Figs. 3-4, VACANTE et al also teaches the evaluation, testing and changes of various targets (job parameter) with the policy. Therefore, even though VACANTE et al discusses about the changing in policies information, the changes in conditions or targets which affect the policies, it would have

been obvious to a skilled artisan to use other type of information such as parameter of the job with the condition information as mere using other type of information which would affect how the traffic is managed (job parameter).

VACANTE et al fails to teach steps (c.), (d) and (e2) according to the comparison and recalculating the inconsistency degree.

In a similar method for system for approximate reasoning, HAYASHI et al teaches steps (c.), (d) and (f) for the benefits of obtaining more accurate results of reasoning (comparing analysis) by applying weight to the knowledge of each data {see col. 2, lines 40-65, col. 3, lines 7-55, col. 4, lines 10-60, Figs. 10-18}. It would have been obvious to modify the teachings of VACANTE et al by adding steps (c.), (d) and (f) as taught by HAYASHI et al to obtain the cited benefits of more accurate results of reasoning or comparing analysis.

As for dep. claim 23 (part of 21 above), which deals with well known job controlling parameters, i.e. outputting results for effective monitoring, it would have been to do so to effectively monitor the changes.

As for dep. claim 24 (part of 21 above), which deals with well known job controlling parameters, i.e. repeating steps (e) and (f), these are well known steps and are taught in col. 3, lines 30-60.

As for **independent apparatus** claim 25, which is merely the apparatus to carry out the method claim 21 above, it's rejected over the apparatus of VACANTE et al and

HAYASHI et al to carry out the rejections of the steps of claim 21 above. Moreover, it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to set up respective apparatus to carry out the method claim 21 above.

As for dep. claims 27-28 (part of 25 above), which have the same limitations as in dep. claims 23-24 (part of 21 above), they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in dep. claims 23 and 24 above.

5. Claims 21, 23-24 (method), 25, 27-28 (apparatus) are rejected (2nd time) under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (1) AHLSTROM et al in view of (2) VACANTE et al and (3) HAYASHI et al.

Similarly, AHLSTROM et al which deals with a method for controlling an information processing system {see Fig. 2A}, comprising the steps of:

- (a) storing a strategy of the information processing system including a provision to policies each of which defines a process to be executed in the system, wherein the strategy is a control (precedent) strategy {see col. 3, lines 40-50},
- (b) defining a job for executing a process for the host computer or the storage apparatus with a parameter for executing {see col. 3, lines 40-50}; and
- (e) changing said parameters so that said policies meet the control (precedent) strategy when said parameters are set to said processes defined in said policies", {see col. 5, lines 34-35, col. 9, lines 14-18, or lines 30-36} and
 - (e2) re-determining the policy conflict or conflict resolution {see Fig. 2A, loops (208), (210) and (212)}.

AHLSTROM et al fails to teach steps (c.), (d) and (f).

Note that VACANTE et al discloses on col. 3, lines 39-60, that a policy is abstract set of rules containing conditions information which, when evaluated, determine how traffic on a network is to be handled. On Figs. 3-4, VACANTE et al also teaches the evaluation, testing and changes of various targets (job parameter) with the policy. Therefore, even though VACANTE et al discusses about the changing in policies information, the changes in conditions or targets which affect the policies, it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to modify the teachings of AHLSTROM et al by using other type of information such as parameter of the job that affect the policy such as job parameter (condition information) as taught by VACANTE et al as mere using other type of information which would affect how the traffic is managed (job parameter).

AHLSTROM et al /VACANTE et al fails to teach steps (c.), (d).

In a similar method for system for approximate reasoning, HAYASHI et al teaches steps (c.), and (d) for the benefits of obtaining more accurate results of reasoning (comparing analysis) by applying weight to the knowledge of each data {see col. 2, lines 40-65, col. 3, lines 7-55, col. 4, lines 10-60, Figs. 10-18}. It would have been obvious to modify the teachings of VACANTE et al by adding steps (c.) and (d) as taught by HAYASHI et al to obtain the cited benefits of more accurate results of reasoning or comparing analysis.

As for dep. claim 23 (part of 21 above), which deals with well known job controlling parameters, i.e. outputting results for effective monitoring, this is taught in AHLSTROM et al col. 1, lines 20-30, Fig. 1 (120).

As for dep. claim 24 (part of 21 above), which deals with well known job controlling parameters, i.e. repeating steps (e1) and (e2), these are well known steps and are taught in AHLSTROM et al Fig. 2A.

As for **independent apparatus** claim 25, which is merely the apparatus to carry out the method claim 21 above, it's rejected over the apparatus of AHLSTROM et al /VACANTE et al and HAYASHI et al to carry out the rejections of the steps of claim 21 above. Moreover, it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to set up respective apparatus to carry out the method claim 21 above.

As for dep. claims 27-28 (part of 25 above), which have the same limitations as in dep. claims 23-24 (part of 21 above), they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in dep. claims 23 and 24 above.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 21, 23-25, 27-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

No claims are allowed.

Art Unit: 3629

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct@uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to the private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).


In receiving an Office Action, it becomes apparent that certain documents are missing, e. g. copies of references, Forms PTO 1449, PTO-892, etc., requests for copies should be directed to Tech Center 3600 Customer Service at (571) 272-3600, or e-mail CustomerService3600@uspto.gov.

Any inquiry concerning the merits of the examination of the application should be directed to Dean Tan Nguyen at telephone number (571) 272-6806. My work schedule is normally Monday through Friday from 6:30 am - 4:00 pm. I am scheduled to be off every other Friday.

Should I be unavailable during my normal working hours, my supervisor John Weiss can be reached at (571) 272-6812.

The main FAX phone numbers for formal communications concerning this application are (571) 273-8300. My personal Fax is (571) 273-6806. Informal communications may be made, following a telephone call to the examiner, by an informal FAX number to be given.

dtn
September 17, 2007



DEAN T. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER